REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed August 23, 2006, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-15 remain pending in this application and currently stand rejected. As shown above, Claims 13 - 15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-15 have been amended to clarify the subject matter and correct minor informalities. New claims 16 and 17 have been added. No new matter has been added by the amendments or new claims. The claims as presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Action rejected claims 1, 3-7, and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,899,276 to Stadler (hereinafter *Stadler*) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,646,250 to Childress (hereinafter *Childress*) and U.S. Patent No. 5,736,984 to Jellinek, *et al* (hereinafter *Jellinek*). Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-15 have been amended and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Applicants' amended claim 1 recites a method for displaying a static information tip that includes, *inter alia*, "receiving an indication of focusing on the first data field, wherein the indication includes placement of a cursor on the first data field", "in response to focusing on the first data field, displaying a first static information tip proximate to the first data field, wherein the first static information tip does not interrupt data input into the first data field", "in response to focusing on the second data field, displaying a second static information tip proximate to the second data field, wherein the first information tip remains displayed until the indication of focusing on the second data field is received", "if the data received in the first data field is erroneous, refocusing on the first data field", and "in response to refocusing on the first data field, displaying a third static information tip proximate to the first data field that is different from the first static information tip, wherein the third static information tip does not interrupt corrective data input into the

first data field." The amendments are supported by the Specification (Specification, page 3, line 4 - page 4, line 14). Among other differences, the combination of *Stadler*, *Childress*, and *Jellinek* do not teach the features of amended claim 1.

Contrary to amended claim 1, *Stadler* teaches a field-directed help screen technique including the steps of positioning the cursor in a field in which an explanation is desired; pressing a "help" key, such as the F1 key; and in response to the "help key" being pressed, displaying a "window" which provides an explanation that is specifically directed to the field in which the cursor is located (*Stadler*: col. 2, lines 38-46; col. 3, lines 38-51). This is not analogous to the method of amended claim 1 because *Stadler* teaches that two steps must be performed, positioning the cursor and then pressing the F1 key, in order to display a window providing an explanation. These steps are in contrast to the method of amended claim 1 which recites one step: displaying a first static information tip proximate to the first data field in response to focusing on the first data field, where the focusing is indicated by placement of a cursor on the first data field.

Furthermore, amended claim 1 recites displaying a third static information tip proximate to the first data field in response to refocusing on the first data field due to determination of an error in received data, where the third static information tip does not interrupt corrective data input into the first data field. Requiring the user to press a "help" key and displaying a separate window are events that interrupt corrective data input into the first data field.

Moreover, *Stadler* discloses that when all the fields have been filled, the next data entry screen may be automatically displayed or the user might be required to press a SAVE key before the data entered into the several fields is saved and the next data entry screen is displayed (*Stadler*: col. 3, lines 22-27). This is not analogous to claim 1 because *Stadler* fails to teach or suggest determining whether the data entered in the first field is erroneous; if the data is erroneous, refocusing on the field; and in response to refocusing on the field, displaying third static information tip. As admitted by the Office Action, *Stadler* fails to teach or suggest any means for determining erroneously received data within a first field or displaying a third static information tip that is different from the first static information tip.

Childress discloses a method for redisplaying erroneous information entered by a user including checking the correctness of data entered by a user into a data entry field, and if an error is detected, then redisplaying the incorrectly entered data with highlighting (*Childress*: Abstract, col. 2, lines 37 - 43). *Childress*, however, does not suggest or teach providing a first information tip in response to focusing on a first data field and providing a third information tip (that is different from the first tip) in response to refocusing on the first data field upon determining the received data in the first field is erroneous.

According to *Childress*, an error in entered data is indicated to the user by highlighting the data field. This is completely different from the Applicants' claimed subject matter, where a first static information tip is displayed proximate to a data field and a third static information tip different from the first tip is displayed if a determination is made that the received data in the data field is erroneous. Thus, *Childress* also fails to teach or suggest features of amended claim 1.

The Office Action admits that the combined teachings of *Stadler* and *Childress* do not disclose or suggest displaying a second static information tip proximate to the second data field, as recited by the amended claim 1, and relies on the teaching of *Jellinek* to allegedly cure these deficiencies. However, like *Stadler* and *Childress*, *Jellinek* does not teach or suggest features of Applicants' claim 1.

Jellinek teaches a method for processing user defined input including receiving input data from a user in a first graphical processing element; receiving a selection of an apply button, in response to receiving the selection of the apply button, determining whether the input data is valid; and if the input is determined invalid, displaying a feedback message in combination with the first graphical processing element in a second graphical processing element (*Jellinek*: Abstract; col. 4, lines 42 - 51; col. 7, lines 19-27). This is not analogous to amended claim 1 because Jellinek fails to teach or suggest in displaying a second static information tip proximate to the second data field, response to focusing on the second data field, where the first information tip proximate to a first data field remains displayed until the indication of focusing on the second data field is received. As recited in claim 1, the indication includes placement of a cursor on the second data field. Instead, *Jellinek* teaches displaying the feedback message in response to a determination that the input is invalid, which is determined in response to receiving a

selection of the apply button. Selection of the apply button is different from placement of a cursor on a data field.

Thus, *Stadler*, *Childress*, and *Jellinek* fail to teach or suggest features of amended claim 1, individually or in combination. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully reiterate that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of *Stadler*, *Childress*, and *Jellinek* and subsequently modify the teaching of *Stadler* as suggested in the Office Action absent the impermissible use of hindsight because, as discussed above, *Stadler* does not teach or suggest determining whether received data within a data field is erroneous or providing a different information tip upon determining the data is erroneous. Instead, *Stadler* teaches that when all the data fields have been filled, the next data entry screen may be automatically displayed or the user might be required to press a SAVE key before the data entered into the several fields is saved and the next data entry screen is displayed. However, there is no suggestion in the teaching of *Stadler* that prior to displaying the next data entry screen or after the next data entry screen is displayed, the data fields are checked to determine if the data received into the fields is erroneous, and if so, providing information that is different from the information provided prior to the determination of erroneous data. Thus, the only motivation for such a combination of teachings and subsequent modification of the teaching of *Stadler* has been deemed from a review of Applicants' invention, not from what is being taught or suggested from the cited art. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the teaching of *Stadler* with the teachings of *Childress* and *Jellinek* is improper. Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5 depend from amended independent claim 1 with additional features. Thus, dependent claims 3-5 are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1. Therefore, based on the foregoing, the rejection of claims 3-5 should also be withdrawn.

Amended claim 6 recites a method for displaying a static information tip and an error marker that includes, *inter alia*, "receiving an indication of focusing on a first data field, wherein the indication includes placement of a cursor on the first data field", "in

response to focusing on the first data field, displaying a first static information tip proximate to the first data field, wherein the first static information tip is displayed such that it does not interrupt data input into the first data field", "receiving data in the first data field while continuing to display the first static information tip", "determining whether the data received into the first data field is erroneous", "if the data received in the first data field is erroneous, placing an error marker adjacent to the first data field", and "automatically refocusing on the first data field, and in response to refocusing on the first data field, displaying a second static information tip proximate to the first data field, the second static information tip containing information for correcting the data received into the first data field."

As discussed above in detail, *Stadler*, *Childress*, and *Jellinek* do not teach or suggest displaying a first static information tip proximate to the first data field that does not interrupt data input into the first data field or if the data received in the first data field is erroneous, placing an error marker adjacent to the first data field, individually or in combination. The cited references also do not teach or suggest automatically focusing on a second data field or automatically refocusing on the first data field upon determining the received data to be erroneous. Therefore, amended claim 6 is allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above and for failing to disclose automatically focusing on a second data field or automatically refocusing on the first data field upon determining the received data to be erroneous. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Amended claim 7 recites a method for computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions which when executed by a computer perform actions similar to the features of the methods claimed in amended claim 1 and 6. For example, the computer-executable instructions of claim 7 include "in response to focusing on the first data field, displaying a first static information tip proximate to the first data field", "automatically focusing on the second data field", "if the data received in the first data field is erroneous, automatically refocusing on the first data field", and "in response to refocusing on the first data field, displaying a third static information tip proximate to the first data field that is different from the first static information tip" *Stadler*, *Childress*, and *Jellinek* do not teach or suggest these and other features of

amended claim 7 as discussed in more detail above. Thus, amended claim 7 is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-11 depend from amended independent claim 7 with additional features. Thus, dependent claims 9-11 are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 7. Therefore, based on the foregoing, the rejection of claims 9-11 should also be withdrawn.

Amended claim 12 recites a system for displaying a static information tip and an error marker comprising a computer program module operative to, *inter alia*, "receive a user indication of focusing on a first data field, wherein the indication includes placement of a cursor on the first data field", "display a first static information tip proximate to the first data field in response to receiving the indication of focusing on the first data field", "place an error marker adjacent to the first data field, if the data entered into the first data field is erroneous", and "display a second static information tip proximate to the first data field in response to refocusing on the first data field, the second static information tip containing information for correcting the data entered into the first data field." *Stadler*, *Childress*, and *Jellinek* do not teach or suggest the above listed and other features of amended claim 12, individually or in combination. Therefore, amended claim 12 is in condition for allowance.

New claims 16 and 17 include additional features to the elements of independent claim 1 and are supported by the Specification (page 5, line 20 - page 6, line 11 and page 8, line 6). Therefore, new claims 16 and 17 are also in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the patentability of the pending claims be disputed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date are hereby solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, PC

Date: November 17, 2006

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

MERCHANT & GOULD, PC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5100